

THE DATE OF DAMOPHON

BY

IDA CARLETON THALLON

*Reprinted from the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY, Second
Series, Vol. X (1906), No. 3*

LYCOSURA AND THE DATE OF DAMOPHON

BY

IDA CARLETON THALLON, A.M.

DISSERTATION

*Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Philosophy,
Columbia University*



1905

THE DATE OF DAMOPHON OF MESSENE

EVER since the discovery in 1889 of the statues by Damophon of Messene in the precinct of Despoena at Lycosura, the date of this sculptor has been one of the unsettled problems of archaeology. In the period immediately following the excavations many widely divergent opinions were set forth, but no definite conclusion was reached. At the time when the following study was begun, the subject had been comparatively little discussed for nearly ten years, and a complete summing up of all the material bearing on it seemed desirable. The publications had for the most part advocated one view of the sculptures, and since the only treatment of the material as a whole for a basis of conclusion was Frazer's excellent though brief summary (*Paus.* Vol. IV, pp. 367 ff.; V, pp. 622 ff.), there seemed room for a more exhaustive discussion of the question.

A good part of my work was completed when the article by A. M. Daniel appeared (*J.H.S.* XXIV, 1904, pp. 41-57), and if I seem to have opposed his arguments more than those of others who agree with him, this is due to the fact that his discussion is not only the most recent, but also the most satisfactory which has appeared.

The material for determining the date of Damophon is of two kinds, literary and archaeological, and, as frequently happens in such cases, there is a difficulty in reconciling the two. The literary evidence is that of Pausanias alone,¹ who, however, speaks of Damophon at some length, and though he affords no clew to his date, gives valuable information in regard to his

¹ IV, 31, 6, 7, 10; VII, 23, 6, 7; VIII, 31, 2, 6; VIII, 37, 3.

style and choice of subjects, as well as a very good description of the site of Lycosura. Without this, identification would have been far less certain. On the basis of this evidence, Damophon was naturally assigned to the fourth century B.C.,¹ and no one thought of disputing this conclusion until the excavations brought to light remains of such a character that many were unable to reconcile them with the accepted date. Those who on stylistic grounds preferred a later date for the statues then tried to interpret Pausanias also as referring to a late period. Thus in the fourth edition of Overbeck's *Gesch. d. griech. Plastik*, II, pp. 485 ff., the statement is made that since Damophon is not mentioned by Pliny, he is later even than Pliny, and consequently that the sculptures belong to the period of Hadrian.

Such an argument from silence is a dangerous one, and I believe no one made use of it as an objection to the fourth century in discussing the evidence before the discovery of the statues, but as soon as they appeared this argument was frequently used. Yet no less than sixty-five sculptors are known to us through Pausanias alone, most of them belonging to the time before Pliny.

A careful examination of Overbeck's *Schriftquellen* with reference to sculptors mentioned only by Pausanias gives the following results:

	POSITIVE.	DOUBTFUL.	TOTAL.
Before Ol. 60	6	2	8
Ol. 60-80	17	7	24
Ol. 80-96	10	1	11

That is to say: until about the fourth century, of forty-three sculptors mentioned, thirty-three may safely be assigned to that century or to an earlier period,² with ten doubt-

¹ Brunn, *Gesch. d. griech. Künstler*², I, pp. 202-204; Overbeck, *Gesch. d. griech. Plastik*³, II, pp. 141 ff.

² (The references are to numbers in Overbeck's *Schriftquellen*.)

Hegylus and Theocles, 328, 329; Dontas and Doryclidas, 330, 331; Clearchus of Rhegium, 332, 333, 490 (cf. 491); Bathycles of Magnesia, 360, 361;

ful.¹ For the remaining twenty-two names Overbeck's figures are:

	POSITIVE.	DOUBTFUL.	TOTAL.
Ol. 96-120	4	6	10
Ol. 120-158	-	4	4
Undetermined	-	8	8

But more recently discovered evidence shows that this must be corrected as follows:

Ol. 96-120	1	5	6
Ol. 120-158	4	4	8
Undetermined	-	8	8 ²

To sum up: thirty-eight sculptors for whom Pausanias is the only literary evidence may safely be dated earlier than the middle of the second century B.C., so it does not necessarily follow that a sculptor who is not mentioned by Pliny need be of a later date. Neither can we say that Damophon was too

Eutelidas and Chrysothemis, 388; Aristomedon, 400; Glaucus and Dionysius, 401, 402; Aristocles, Synnoon, Ptolichus, 411-413; Theopropus, 441; Philesius, 442; Aristomedes and Socrates of Thebes, 478; Glaucias, 429-432; Menaechmus and Soïdas, 479; Aristocles, 483; Dameas of Croton, 484; Paeonius of Mende, 851, 852; Theocosmus, 855; Periclytus, 985; Alypus of Sicyon, 1002, 1003; Polycelitus the Younger, 1004, 1005; Antiphanes of Argos, 1006; Nicodamus of Maenalus, 1026, 1027-1030; Ptolichus, 463; Amphion, 463, 464; Pison, 463, 465, 979.

¹ Cheirisophus, 345; Gitladas of Sparta, 357-359; Aristonous, 439; Callon of Elis, 475, 476; Serambus, 440; Ascarus, 477; Pythodorus of Thebes, 485; Hermion of Troezen, 486; Laphaës of Phlius, 487, 488.

² Period Ol. 96-120: Daitondas, 1582, time of Alexander the Great (Loewy, *Inscr. Griech. Bildh.* 97).

Doubtful: Olympiosthenes, 878; Xenocritus and Eubius, 1578; Onasimedes, 1580; Hippias, 1616. The following sculptors, assigned by Overbeck to Ol. 96-120, must be placed in the period Ol. 120-158: Ppyrlampes of Messene, 1565-1567, (*Inscr. v. Olymp.* 400; Loewy, *Inscr. Griech. Bildh.* 274); Theron, 1576, (*Inscr. v. Pergamon*, I, 49; Loewy, *Inscr. Griech. Bildh.* 156); Andreas, 1588 (called doubtful by Overbeck), (*Inscr. v. Olymp.* 318; Loewy, *Inscr. Griech. Bildh.* 475); Damophon of Messene, 1557-1564 (date to be determined).

Period Ol. 120-158, doubtful: Dionysicles of Magnesia, 2054; Lysus of Macedonia, 2062; Attalus of Athens, 2067; Hermogenes of Cythera, 2074.

Of unknown place and date: Somis, 2078; Asterion, son of Aeschylus, 2079; Musus, 2080; Phylacus, Onaethus and sons, 2081; Tisagoras, 2082.

important to be omitted by Pliny if he antedated Pliny, for Pausanias (Overbeck, *Schriftquellen*, 332, 333, 490) is the only authority for Clearchus of Rhegium (except an incorrect inference from Pausanias by Suidas, Overbeck, *Schriftquellen*, 491), and Onatas (*ibid.*, 421-428) is found elsewhere only in an epigram by Antipater (*ibid.*, 424).

The characteristics of Damophon as described by Pausanias have been summed up and carefully examined by Brunn (*Gesch. d. griech. Künstler*², I, pp. 202-204), Overbeck (*Plastik*³, II, pp. 141 ff.), and others under the following heads: (1) his religious tendency; (2) his liking for marble and acrolithic technique (instead of bronze), both of which techniques are contrary to the usual traditions of the Peloponnesian school; (3) his connection with the Zeus of Phidias.

(1) A full discussion of his religious tendency is given by Overbeck, who connects it with the previous (Phidian) period, showing that Damophon returns to the best religious ideas of his predecessors, but that at the same time he evinces progress. Others also have connected this tendency with the return to the age of Phidias, but all we really have a right to say is that the preference for a somewhat severe interpretation of religious subjects, which is not characteristic of the fourth century, may be referred to the influence of Phidias. We cannot say certainly when that influence would have been most likely to make itself felt.

(2) Overbeck considers marble and acrolithic technique appropriate to Damophon's religious tendencies, as marble was generally used for sacred statues. Nothing definite, however, can be said about the date of acrolithic statues; they were evidently a development from early ξόανα,¹ and the fact that they were less costly resulted in the retention of this technique after the introduction of chryselephantine statues. Phidias, indeed, is said to have intended to make the Athena Parthenos an

¹ Cf. Daremberg et Saglio, *Dict. des Antiq. gr. et rom.*, s.v. "Acrolithus."

acrolithic statue,¹ and he actually made one statue of this technique for Plataea (Paus. IX, 4, 1). Among others who used this technique was Leochares (cf. Vitruv. II, 8, 11). The technique was continued in Roman times, and we may reasonably conclude that it probably was employed in all periods from early Greek times.

(3) The connection with the Zeus of Phidias. This is one of the reasons why an early date has been assigned to Damophon. Overbeck (*Plastik*³, I, p. 262; 4th ed., I, p. 362) says that hardly sixty years passed before the repairs made by Damophon became necessary; but this statement is evidently based on the historical grounds for assigning Damophon to about 370 B.C. (the date of the foundation of Megalopolis, which would be sixty years after 430 B.C.). Pausanias says nothing regarding the date of repairs, only that when the statue cracked it was repaired by Damophon, and the Eleans paid him honor (IV, 31, 6). It is of course idle to guess how long a statue might exist before repairs would be needed.

The suggestion has been made that Damophon may have had merely a local² fame (E. A. Gardner, *Handbook of Gk. Sculpture*, p. 399, note 2), but we at least know that he was selected for important work at Olympia, and he is certainly highly rated by Pausanias (IV, 31, 10), whose judgment in this case is confirmed by an examination of the statues.

Summing up this part of the literary evidence, we find nothing conclusive about the date. Any of Damophon's characteristics described by Pausanias may occur as well in one period as in another. We have seen that acrolithic statues exist in many periods, that the repairing of the statue of Zeus might

¹ *Iidem* Phidiam tulerunt, quam diu is marmore potius quam ebore Minervam fieri debere dicebat, quod diutius nitor esset mansurus, sed ut adjecit, et vilius stare, tacere iusserunt. (Val. Max., Lib. I, Cap. I, Extr. 7 e Paride.)

Phidias *ibidem* eboris sculptor ait sumptu minore incipere diis simulacra fieri, quod ipsi irati ex ebore Athenienses iusserunt. (Val. Max., Lib. I, Cap. I, Extr. 7 e Nepotiano.)

² It is of course through a slip of the pen that Gardner says "Arcadia, where all his works were set up." They were at any rate in or near Arcadia, and the point is the same.

take place at any date, that the choice of religious subjects (after the religious idea had had its full development in Phidias) is hardly characteristic of any period. There is, of course, no doubt that the fourth century shows a breaking away from severe religious subjects, as is illustrated on the one hand by the athletic Peloponnesian school, and on the other by the graceful later Attic school.

It is just here that the element of historical probability has been called in as an aid to determining the date.

The historical grounds for assigning Damophon to the fourth century have been briefly summed up by Frazer¹ as follows: "Before the discovery of the temples and the fragments of the statues at Lycosura it had been commonly supposed that the many statues by Damophon in the temples at Messene and Megalopolis (IV, 31, 6, 7, 10; VIII, 31, 1-4, 6) had been made by him for these cities at the time of the foundation of Megalopolis and the restoration of Messene in 369 and 370 B.C.; in particular it was thought that the group at Messene which comprised an image of the city of Thebes and a statue of Epaminondas (though the latter was the work of a different artist) must certainly have been set up in honor of the Thebans and their great general Epaminondas by the grateful Messenians after their deliverance from the yoke of Sparta."

The facts here stated constitute by far the strongest argument on the side of the fourth century. The natural conclusion certainly is that the Messenians would commemorate their indebtedness to Thebes and particularly to Epaminondas as soon as possible, but in the face of other evidence it is necessary to consider whether it may not have been historically possible for Damophon to be at work at some other period.

His works, as we know, were in Lycosura, Megalopolis, Messene, and Aegium. Now Aegium is best known as the capital of the Achaean League from the third century onward, and the importance of Megalopolis in the League needs no demonstration, since in the time of Lydiadas it was already a member

¹ *Pausanias*, Vol. IV, pp. 378-379, with references.

(Paus. VIII, 27, 12), and took an active leadership in affairs. After the destruction of the city by Cleomenes in 222 B.C. it soon rose to power under Philopoemen and appears to have been the ruling spirit in the federation. The position of Messene in the League was less consistent, but it was a member before 222 B.C. (Paus. IV, 29, 7) and was in constant relations with Megalopolis. After the destruction of Megalopolis, it was to Messene that the fugitives made their escape (Paus. VIII, 27, 15) and at this time the cities were close friends and allies (Paus. VIII, 49, 4; IV, 29, 8). In spite of dissension and disagreement Messene was again in the League after the death of Philopoemen (Paus. IV, 29, 12) and, with the exception of an occasional withdrawal, was pretty consistently a member from about 200 to 146 B.C. Lycosura appears to have been of no political importance, but its close connection with Megalopolis at all periods from 230 B.C. until the time of Hadrian is well attested by inscriptions.¹

In addition to the historical records of the activity of Megalopolis during the second century and onward, there is important archaeological evidence which came to light during the excavations by the British School. (1) By far the greatest number of inscriptions date from the second or first centuries B.C. (*Excav. at Megalopolis*, pp. 122 ff.), although a few of earlier date were discovered. Of these later ones *C.I.G.* 1534, dating from the late second or early first century, is of especial interest because it mentions the road to Lycosura. (2) The walls represent two periods of building, the first

¹ Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1895, cols. 263 ff.; 1896, 101 ff., 217 ff.; 1898, 249 ff. Nos. 1 (Lydiadas), 2 (family of Lycortas), 3 (dedication to Despoena by a Megalopolitan), 4 (Hadrian's statue erected by the city of Megalopolis), 5 (honorary decree of Nicasippus, one copy to be at Megalopolis and a stele in the precinct of Despoena), 8 and 9 (statues dedicated to Despoena by the city of Megalopolis and the city of Lycosura), 11 (statue erected by the city of Megalopolis and the city of Lycosura), 13 (decree of Achaeans in honor of Saon the Megalopolitan for his benefits to the precinct of Despoena), 17 (honorary decree of Xenarchus and Nicippa by the city of Megalopolis, to be set up in the precinct), 19 and 20 (fragments mentioning the names of Lycosurans, Xenarchus [the Megalopolitan], and the sanctuary of Despoena).

dating from the time of the foundation of the city in 370 B.C. ; the second from the rebuilding after the battle of Sellasia (221 B.C.). Livy (XLI, 20) says that Antiochus Epiphanes gave money to the Megalopolitans (*ca.* 175 B.C.) to build their town walls (probably only superficial repairs; see *Exc. at Megal.*, p. 115). (3) Without going into details, it may safely be said that at least two periods of building, the fourth and second centuries, are illustrated in the many structures at Megalopolis, some of which, like the Philippiian colonnade, are apparently repairs or rebuilding of old edifices (*Exc. at Megal.*, p. 66), while others, like the theatre, seem to have been added to or changed many times. Not without significance, too, in this connection is an inscription from Olympia (Loewy, *Inscr. Griech. Bildh.* 475) which records a dedication by the Achaean League in 176-169 B.C., showing that as an organization the states still maintained their relations with the great sanctuary at that date.

From what has been said there appears to be no reason on historical grounds why Damophon might not as well have flourished in the second century as in the fourth.

It is, however, necessary to consider the historical probability connected with the statue of Thebes at Messene which favors the fourth century. Pausanias, it should be remembered, expressly says that the statue of Epaminondas in this Theban group was by a different artist. Now in accordance with the argument which rests on historical probability, the statue of Epaminondas would be erected at once. This eliminates the possibility that its sculptor was later than Damophon and leaves us with the conclusion that the statue was either contemporary with Damophon or earlier. Here it is difficult not to fall into pure speculation, for if we argue against its being contemporary by saying, "If contemporary why did not Damophon make it?", we may be met with the objection that Damophon was not a sculptor of portraits. The statement of Pausanias that Damophon was the only Messenian sculptor of note of whom he knew gives some color to the theory that possibly the Messenians set up the

statue of Epaminondas immediately, and that during the career of their famous sculptor the statue of Thebes was erected. Thus, since it seems possible that Damophon worked at either the earlier or the later period, we find that the historical probability for the fourth century is by no means as "overpowering" as has been stated,¹ although the inference that he worked then is certainly a natural one.

Let us now pass from literary to archaeological evidence and consider first the testimony of the architecture.

The date of the temple has given rise to much discussion, and even in the light of all our present information it is impossible to assign it with certainty to a given period. We have, however, the following definite facts about the building.

In certain parts, namely the foundations and courses with *orthostatae*, mortar is not used, the blocks being fastened by -shaped clamps, but mortar is used freely in plastering the inner surface of the walls, and in the mosaic floor. Two different periods of building are probably to be assumed, and this conclusion is further strengthened by the inscription ('Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1896, cols. 217 ff., No. 17), which relates to the restoration of the temple in the second century of our era. Another inscription ('Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1896, col. 236, No. 27) mentions some repairs which were made, but unfortunately the name of the building to which it refers is missing, and so it cannot be used as positive evidence. Dörpfeld's dating of the whole temple as of one period (*Athen. Mitth.* 1893, pp. 219-221) was published before the discovery of this inscription, which would, however, in no way affect his dating of the lower parts of the temple, and these, whatever their date, are conceded to be contemporary with the statues and their base.

From the lower parts alone it is impossible to determine the date, for, although Daniel (*J.H.S.* 1904, pp. 54-55) shows that the draft margin around the *orthostatae* belongs in the fourth century at Megalopolis, the use of this margin appears in the Palaestra at Olympia (cf. Curtius and Adler, *Olympia*,

¹ Percy Gardner, *Cl. R.*, 1897, p. 71.

Taf. LXXV ; Textb. II. pp. 116 and 121) dated as belonging to the end of the third or the beginning of the second century B.C. This shows that it was not used exclusively in the fourth century. The -shaped clamps, when once adopted in the latter part of the fourth century, remained in use thereafter, and the undercutting of the step-risers (Πρακτικά, 1896, p. 103) is found at Megalopolis in the Philippian Colonnade dated early in the second century B.C. (*Exc. at Megal.* p. 66 ; cf. Frazer, *Paus.* Vol. IV, p. 322).

But a large part of the building still remains undated : the brick walls and the whole superstructure. These I have preferred to consider separately in view of the contradictory statements about the material by which these bricks were bonded together.

We find the following assertions by Leonardos (Πρακτικά, 1896, p. 105): (1) On the western wall of the temple, pieces of lime or plaster were found sticking to the stone course, (2) in the pronaos a brick was found smeared *ὡς ἀσβέστης*. Probably the plaster referred to by Leonardos is not the usual hard Roman plaster, but the same as that "poor mortar" referred to by Dörpfeld, which he says must have bonded the bricks, but could not have been good Roman plaster, since the bricks were not of the usual Roman style. Dörpfeld (*Athen. Mitth.* 1893, p. 219) says that even in the *orthostatae* there were traces of poor plaster as well as clay. Frazer (*l. c.*) observes that the mortar seems to have disappeared since the excavation. If, however, Leonardos means hard Roman plaster, some of it may easily have spilled into the cracks between the bricks when the inner surface of the wall was being done over. He does not discuss the date, confining himself merely to a statement of the discoveries.

Cavvadias (*Fouilles de Lycosoura*, I, p. 8, note 1) says that all the temple except the *orthostatae* and the pedestal of the statues was reconstructed in the Roman period, and his view is accepted by Frazer (*Paus.* Vol. IV, pp. 370-371). But this seems improbable, for in that case it would be necessary to

account for the destruction of the walls of the earlier periods, and of the earlier entablature, or else to suppose that the entablature was a perishable one of wood — an obviously absurd hypothesis for a building as late as the fourth century. The natural conclusion then is that the whole temple belonged to the earlier period, and that in Roman times the walls were plastered, the floors relaid, and any other necessary repairs made.

Whether the poor and careless forms of the marble members is due to their lateness, as is the opinion of Dörpfeld (*Athen. Mitth.* 1893, p. 220), or to lack of skill on the part of the workmen (Daniel, *J.H.S.* 1904, p. 54), does not admit of proof, and cannot therefore be used as an argument in favor of one date or another. We are justified only in saying that the original may be as early as the latter part of the fourth century, or may date from any time between then and the Roman period.

Several fragments of roof-tiles were found inscribed with the name of Despoena.¹ It is hardly safe to say that these date the building in the second or first century B.C., for tiles are easily replaced.

The drum of a column (Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1896, col. 234, No. 25; *Πρακτικά*, 1896, p. 106) inscribed with architect's marks Ε Ξ is not dated, but from the forms of the letters,² if it be possible to draw any conclusion from these, it would appear to belong to the time between about 146 B.C. and the Christian era.³ It is unfortunate that this inscription is the only one undated in the official reports. When we consider that as far as architectural evidence goes the date may be any time between about 330 B.C. and the late Roman period, this inscription taken in connection

¹ I have not been able to learn the date of these tiles from either the *Πρακτικά* or the *Δελτίον*. In the *Exc. at Megal.* (p. 141) they are spoken of as belonging to "various periods," and according to the statement in *Athen. Mitth.* 1893, p. 221, they must belong to the second or first century B.C.

² Reinach, *Traité d'Épigraphie Grecque*, p. 204.

³ Larfeld, *Handbuch d. griech. Epigraphik*, II, p. 467, gives Ε as occurring in *C.I.A.* II², 1137 (303/2 B.C.) along with Ε; but the round form does not become common until the end of the first century B.C. (pp. 477, 481).

with the apparent date of the roof-tiles tends to make the second or first century a more probable date than the fourth.

Furthermore, the very striking lack of early inscriptions is of importance in determining the date of the temple. There is not one letter of epigraphical evidence which goes back to a date earlier than 230 B.C., while all the other inscriptions date from the second century B.C. to the second century after Christ, most of them belonging to the Christian era.¹ The inscription next in age to the isolated Lydiadas inscription (230 B.C.) is separated from it by an interval of more than fifty years. Thus it is almost easier to imagine that this statue (with its basis) was removed from its original site, perhaps in Megalopolis, at the time of the construction of the temple, than that the inscription was the only one set up in the precinct during a period of fifty years (if we date the temple as contemporary with it), or of one hundred and fifty years (if we date the temple in the fourth century). It is an interesting fact that the well-known persons in history (before the Roman Emperors) represented at Lycosura by inscription or portrait were prominent in the Achaean League. Inscription 1 ('Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1895, cols. 263 ff.) is in honor of Lydiadas, the tyrant of Megalopolis. Inscription 2 (*l. c.*) gives the following names in the family of Lycortas (in addition to that of Lycortas himself), Thearides I, his son, Philopoemen, his grandson, Thearides II, his great-grandson. Philopoemen was probably named for the general, who was a friend of Lycortas. The style of the letters is entirely appropriate to this chronology. Lycortas was the father of Polybius, the importance of whose share in the affairs of the Achaean League is of course well known (Paus. VIII, 30, 8-9). A relief representing Polybius, with an inscription stating that Greece would not have fallen if she had entirely followed his advice and that in her misfortune he alone had succored her, was in the stoa at Lycosura (Paus. VIII, 37, 2).

¹ For a detailed discussion of the inscriptions see 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1895, cols. 263 ff.; 1896, cols. 101 ff., 217 ff.; 1898, cols. 249 ff. No attempt, however, is there made to draw any conclusion as to the date from the evidence of the inscriptions as a whole.

The later inscriptions show that the cult continued until after 100 A.D. From the statements of Pausanias one would infer that there were no signs of its decay, but these inscriptions show a sad lack of public spirit and of interest in the mysteries. Evidently the frugal inhabitants of Lycosura thought it economical to allow some liberal citizen to provide grain and pay all necessary expenses, and then to set up a statue to him to cancel the account. And yet the number of later inscriptions points to some sort of a revival of interest in the cult, although it must be confessed that most of the dedications to the goddess appear to have been statues of donors.

The value of the evidence of the inscriptions as a whole has hitherto been disregarded, but it seems to me a very important matter, since the date of each inscription can be definitely determined. Taken together, the inscriptions show that with one exception nothing is earlier than the second century B.C.

Another fact worthy of consideration is that at Messene there was a school of sculptors in the second and first centuries B.C. Inscriptions from Olympia, Messene, and Megalopolis (*Excav. at Megal.* p. 134; Loewy, *Inscr. Griech. Bildh.* 271-274) are a sufficient proof of this. No inscription with the name of Damophon was found at Megalopolis or Olympia, but Damophon's activity at Olympia may have been largely (if not exclusively) confined to the repairing of the statue of Zeus. And in connection with this comes in a third piece of evidence, an inscription (on a statue-basis which still bears traces of the feet upon it) with the name of Damophon.

ΛΟΞΔΑΜΟΦΩΝΤ
ΓΑΛΜΑ ΛΞΑΓ
ΙΚΑΙΤΑΙΠΟΛΕΙ

With this was another inscription showing the name in a mutilated form.¹ These inscriptions were found at Messene

¹Ξ ΔΑΜ
ΩΝΟΞ ΔΑΜC
ΤΟΥΤF

and are dated by Wilhelm at the end of the second century B.C. (*Athen. Mitth.* 1891, p. 355).

The value of inscriptions as evidence is too obvious to need more than passing mention. In the present case they are the only absolutely definite evidence at our disposal. As has already been shown, the literary and the architectural evidence are open to different interpretations, and the only reason for preferring the fourth century as a date to the second century is the historical probability, a reasonably strong probability undoubtedly, but nevertheless by no means absolutely cogent and without anything like the authority of actual proof. But the inscriptions from Lycosura establish more than a strong probability, and on their evidence alone the natural inference as to the date would point to the second century. When in addition we learn that at that time a school of sculptors flourished at Messene, and, to crown all, find the very name of Damophon on a basis of that period, further proof seems almost unnecessary.

Probably no statues discovered in recent times (except perhaps the Aphrodite of Melos) have given rise to more discussion of style and date than these works of Damophon. Unfortunately, most of these notices have been written without a sufficient study of all the evidence, though Daniel's recent discussion should be excepted from such a criticism.

Robert's interesting arguments in favor of the period of Hadrian (*Hermes*, 1894, pp. 429-435) have been well refuted by Daniel. The epigraphical and architectural evidence render this theory no longer tenable.¹ The resemblance to certain of the Graeco-Roman sarcophagi proves nothing, for Roman art necessarily borrowed much from the Greek, which it reproduced in its own fashion.

Sittl (Von Müller's *Handbuch*, VI, p. 751) supports this late date, basing his belief on the mistaken idea that Dörpfeld dates the temple in the Roman period and also on the supposition

¹ Robert is also the author of the article "Damophon" in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real Encycl.* IV, p. 2079.

that "such a person [as Damophon] seems hardly possible before the time of Hadrian."

Overbeck (*Gesch. d. griech. Plastik*, 4th ed., II, pp. 181, 485) bases his acceptance of this date (1) on architecture, which we have seen to be of undetermined period, (2) on the character of the remains (here he follows Robert), (3) on the silence of Pliny, which we have seen to be of no value as an argument.

Conze's view (*Arch. Anz.* 1893, p. 125) in favor of about 200 B.C. is based on the style and technique of the sculptures, as is that of Milchhöfer (*Berl. Phil. W.* 1895, pp. 948 ff.), who says that nothing prevents them from being as early as the Hellenistic period, since they show the pure forms of the third and second centuries.

Collignon's view (*Hist. de la Sculpture grecque*, II, pp. 626-630) is evidently a compromise, for he cannot accept the drapery as genuine Greek work, though the types of the heads hark back to the fourth century.

By Kekule-Zahn (Baedeker, *Greece*, 1905, p. cxxiv) Damophon is assigned to the second century on the grounds of style, and attention is called to the reaction which took place at that time after the excesses of the Pergamene school. The drapery is regarded as a characteristic specimen of Hellenistic decorative art.

Of those who date the sculptures in the fourth century some do so for reasons of style, others on the historical grounds discussed above, and they attempt to reconcile the sculptures to that period.

Waldstein (quoted by Frazer, *Paus.* Vol. IV, p. 278) says that even without the information of Pausanias they would have been considered by any competent authority as remarkable works of the fourth century. He calls them (*Athenaeum*, 1890, I, p. 377) the most important works (with the Sidon sarcophagi) since the discovery of the Hermes, and states *as a fact* that Damophon was a fourth-century sculptor and a contemporary of Scopas, Praxiteles, and Lysippus.¹

¹ His brief article in *J.H.S.* 1904, pp. 330-331, although it contains one or two statements to which exception might be taken, adds nothing new to the discussion.

Cavvadias (*Fouilles de Lycosoura*, I, p. 13) also dates the statues in the fourth century on the basis of style. The qualities which he enumerates, perfection of modelling, beauty of forms, energy and vigor of style, careful execution *sans recherche*, harmony in the ornament of the peplos, and admirable arrangement of the figures, can all be recognized, and his statement that we "cannot doubt they are purely Greek" (not Roman) is quite justified, but that we "easily recognize works of the fourth century" is scarcely borne out by the divergent views held by archaeologists in regard to the sculptures.

Diehl and Reinach favor the fourth century in a tentative way. Diehl's reference (*Revue des Études grecques*, 1894, p. 233) to Damophon as a master of the fourth century is probably made for historical reasons, inasmuch as he says the fourth century date has been disputed by Conze on the basis of style and by Dörpfeld on architectural grounds. He by no means considers the delicate question settled.

Reinach (*Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 1894, I, pp. 229-233), accepting the historical probability, reconciles the sculptures to that date. The largeness of style he says indisputably recalls Phidias. To me it does not appear evident that Anytus is an echo of Olympian Zeus. The coins of Elis, which are our best source, are utterly different in style. Urging the general resemblance in spirit to Phidias, Reinach attempts to date the sculptures from Lycosura in the fourth century, since a comparison with some heads of the last part of the first century B.C. shows a great difference in style. Even then it is manifestly due to other than intrinsic reasons that he attempts to prove the early date, for he says that, if these heads had been found in Italy, they would be called Hellenistic works of the second century where all unclassified things go. The Lycosura statues according to him show no traces of Pergamene or Rhodian influence (about 200 B.C.) and therefore must antedate the Pergamene and Rhodian schools. We are left to infer that the fourth century is their most natural place. Reinach elsewhere, however (*R. Arch.* 1894, II, p. 88), refers

to his support of the traditional date, but says it is by no means certain.

E. A. Gardner's treatment of the subject (*Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, pp. 399 ff.) is not exhaustive. There are some general remarks to the effect that Damophon "introduced some characteristics unfamiliar in Greek art till a later period" and "made innovations . . . which anticipate the customs of the Hellenistic age." "He may best be understood if we regard him as a man who lived in the fourth century, but apart from the general stream of its artistic tendencies, feeling deeply the high ideals of the age of Phidias." Probably no one will dispute his extremely conservative statement that Damophon's place is intermediate between the art of Athens under Pericles and the art of Pergamon under the Attalids.¹

Percy Gardner's views are summed up in the *Classical Review* (1897, p. 71). The drapery is a source of difficulty to him; and he adopts the ingenious compromise that the drapery may have been a later addition, for the historical probabilities in favor of the fourth century "are so overpowering that we must very closely scrutinize any archaeological evidence on the other side" (quoted by Frazer, *Paus.* Vol. V, p. 625). But we have seen that they are after all not so overpowering.

The most recent argument in favor of the fourth century is that of Daniel. This is based on a careful, though apparently only a partial, weighing of the evidence, and a more exhaustive study of the sculptures in the light of comparative methods. His conclusion is stated in no dogmatic manner, but only

¹ Professor Gardner (*J.H.S.* 1906, pp. 169-175, and *Appendix* to his *History of Greek Sculpture*, p. 548) regards the head from Tegea, first published in *B.C.H.* XXV, Pls. IV, VI, as that of the Atalanta of Scopas, and says (*J.H.S.* 1906, p. 175), "We have already noted the resemblance to the Atalanta of the head of Artemis from Lycosura and the consequent confirmation of the fourth century date of Damophon." His arguments in favor of the authorship of the head are not very convincing. Moreover, G. F. Hill (*Cl. R.* 1906, p. 284) disputes the connection between the torso of the Atalanta and the head, which he regards as unworthy of it. Damophon can hardly be dated in the fourth century because of the likeness between Artemis and this head, which is attributed to Scopas chiefly because of its supposed connection with the torso.

as supported by greater probability. There are, however, some important omissions in his discussion. His conclusion (pp. 52-53) rests on the character of the sculpture, — both in itself and compared with a large female head in the Capitoline museum (Helbig, *Guide*, 445; Fig. 5 in Daniel's article), — the statements of Pausanias, and the demonstration that the style of architecture is like that at Megalopolis in the late fourth century.

But it has already been shown that, although the architecture may possibly be as early as the fourth century, this is by no means an exclusive possibility, and that the statements of Pausanias, in so far as they refer to the style and tendencies of Damophon, are of no value in determining the date, while the historical probability in favor of the fourth century over the second (both possible dates) rests chiefly on the supposition that the statue of Thebes would be erected at once. It is therefore now in order to discuss Daniel's statements on the basis of the style of the sculpture.

Let us begin with the Capitoline head, for it is through this that Daniel traces the connection of Damophon with the traditions of the school of the fourth century. The resemblance of this head to works of Damophon has been pretty generally recognized and needs no proof. Daniel shows that the resemblance lies in the modelling of the cheeks, the "drawing" of the lids and lips, and especially in the peculiar treatment of the eye. If he had been able to prove a resemblance between Damophon and an undisputed work of the fourth century, his point would be convincing, but this head cannot be dated as even a relatively early one. Furtwängler (*Meisterwerke*, p. 644, note 3) has assigned it to the late Hellenistic period, Helbig to the second or first century. Daniel himself, while once speaking of it (p. 52) as "undoubtedly Greek," classes it (p. 51) with the colossal heads belonging to a period after the fourth century, manifestly Hellenistic works, like the Ludovisi Hera (Helbig, 872), or the Demeter (Helbig, 880), or Hygieia (Helbig, 876) of the same collection, which repeat fourth century types,

and he goes no further than to say that this head strongly suggests types of the fourth century (p. 53). He dates it later than Damophon on the grounds of greater formalism in the hair, greater closeness in the drawing and contour, and because it is colossal in the sense of "too big." Admitting the force of these observations, we are still justified only in the conclusion that Damophon is earlier than the late Hellenistic period. Granted that in the Capitoline head both elements, that of Scopas (of the fourth century) and that of Damophon (of doubtful date), are to be recognized, it is nevertheless by no means a necessary inference that two things which precede a third are contemporary. Therefore "the judgment that Damophon was of the fourth century" hardly "follows directly and at once," for on the basis of this head we may date Damophon at any time before the late Hellenistic period. A distinction seems to be made between Scopas and Damophon (pp. 46, 51) and, further, the qualities in the head which are particularly characteristic of Damophon (cheeks, lips, and lids) have not been shown to be exclusively characteristic of the fourth century. Had they been, we should have expected to find them in the works of Praxiteles and Scopas, but the use of this Hellenistic head as the closest parallel to Damophon points rather the other way.

There are, of course, certain fourth century traits in this late head, as there are in most later works of any merit. The influence of Scopas and very likely of Lysippus¹ seems to have been as universal as it was long enduring — persisting in an exaggerated way even in the works of the Pergamene school; in Damophon himself we admit certain fourth century qualities, but whether they exhibit the spirit of the fourth century or merely its lasting influence is another question. The other heads (particularly the Asclepius of Piraeus and the Poseidon of Melos), most closely resembling Damophon's work, Daniel sets aside for the present, preferring to trace the likeness

¹ On the subject of Lysippus see Percy Gardner, *J.H.S.* 1903, pp. 117 ff., and especially 'The Apoxyomenos of Lysippus,' *J.H.S.* 1905, pp. 234 ff.

to a head of as early date as possible; but it is unfortunate that the head selected should be one generally regarded as late Hellenistic, and of a class which copies in a more or less banal fashion the types of the fourth and fifth centuries.

The evidence, then, of the Capitoline head is of just the same value as the architectural and literary and historical evidence, all of which admits more than one possible date, while establishing none definitely.

As far as Daniel's article goes there remains in favor of the fourth century only the style of the sculptures themselves, and with reference to this he very justly says that each can but lay down his own opinion with the best evidence he can produce. It is exactly at this point that the greatest difficulty occurs, for in the discussions quoted above it is evident that the subjective element enters into the criticisms to a great extent, and the sculptures are so admittedly inconsistent and contradictory that no one would be rash enough to hope to convince every one else on the basis of style alone. What I shall have to say on the subject will be used mainly to illustrate how Damophon may perfectly well be assigned to the period in which the epigraphical evidence places him — or rather, that his peculiar characteristics may best be understood if we assign him to this period.

The remarks of Pausanias about Damophon's choice of religious subjects, coupled with the statement about his repairing the Olympian Zeus, led naturally enough to the view which connects him with the traditions of Phidias and the somewhat severe style. But we must keep in mind the distinction between choice of subject (in which it is true that he is more conservative than most artists of the fourth century) and the spirit in which these works were conceived and executed. If we compare the Lycosura heads with those of the fifth century, do we find reflected in them the severity of the Phidian period? Do we find even the feeling of the fourth century, not so severe, but nevertheless religious? Compare these heads with the Hermes of Praxiteles, or the type of the Aphrodite of

Cnidus, and the difference will at once be seen. This lack of idealism is due in large measure to the characteristic described by Daniel as discrimination of character without portraiture. This discrimination of character, while thoroughly consistent in each head and well suited to it, is at the same time so general in its spirit that each head might as well be that of a mortal as of a god. This trait has been noticed before: Frazer (*Paus.* Vol. IV, p. 375) speaks of the head of Demeter as that of any lady; Farnell (*Cults of the Greek States*, II, p. 548) says of the Artemis "it impresses us rather as the face of a healthy girl, joyous and eager, than as the face of a goddess." Daniel too seems to feel this, for we find (p. 46), "Artemis has the form and fashion of a young girl," "Demeter, a matron and carrying the burden of many legends." There is lacking the spirit of the fifth and fourth centuries, which enables us, although there may exist differences of opinion as to which god is represented (as for example in the Parthenon frieze), nevertheless to recognize a god as such; and no one would take the Hermes of Praxiteles for an ordinary Greek youth, or the type of the head of the Cnidian Aphrodite for that of a young woman of the time. The idealizing tendency is still too strong.

Since, then, we find that the works of Damophon express a feeling which, instead of being more severe and religious than that of most works of the fourth century, is really less so, we shall have some difficulty in explaining why, if he lived in the fourth century, he was chosen to make so many cult-statues, which should of course be preëminently religious. At Megalopolis, besides the works of Damophon, there were statues by Polyclitus the younger (*Paus.* VIII, 31, 4), and by Cephisodotus and Xenophon (*Paus.* VIII, 30, 10), all of whom flourished at the time of the founding of Megalopolis. Polyclitus was trained in the traditions of the fifth century school of Polyclitus the elder, while Cephisodotus belonged to the conservatives and made only slight deviations from the older and standard types (Murray, *Greek Sculpture*, II, p. 244, quoted by Frazer, *Paus.* Vol. IV, p. 327). Xenophon is known chiefly

in connection with Cephisodotus (Paus. VIII, 30, 10 ; IX, 16, 1) and was in all probability in sympathy with his tendencies. Therefore to the Megalopolitans, who had among them the works of these conservative sculptors and who must have been thoroughly accustomed to a comparatively severe style, the statues of Damophon would have been likely to appear lacking in religious feeling. If we assign these sculptures to the fourth century, we must account for the selection of Damophon by the Megalopolitans on the ground of necessity or of choice. To say that there were no more sculptors who preserved the religious spirit, is, of course, absurd. If the people of Megalopolis needed more statues to decorate their temples, they might have had some works of Praxiteles, or of Scopas (who worked at Tegea near by), or, if they could not afford works by the greatest sculptors of the day, they might at least have had statues by pupils who maintained the traditions of these great men. The many works of high merit which, although they cannot be definitely attributed to any great sculptors, are at least based on their style, is a sufficient proof that at the middle or end of the fourth century there would have been no difficulty in procuring works of those who were the legitimate successors of Cephisodotus, Xenophon, and Polyclitus, or of Scopas and Praxiteles.

If we accept the alternative that the Megalopolitans preferred works executed in a spirit like that of Damophon, rather than like the spirit of their time, we shall have difficulty in finding precedents for such a procedure. It is a well-known tendency of religious conservatism to retain a cult-type long after it has become antiquated as a phase in the development of art, and it is hardly conceivable that the people to whom the statues by Cephisodotus, Xenophon, and Polyclitus were familiar and sanctified by association would view with favor the tendencies of Damophon. But by the time of the destruction and rebuilding of the city several generations had passed. Men were different in spirit from the men of earlier times and familiar with the development of new tendencies in art,

and to them the work of Damophon would not appear erratic and full of innovations.

Further, the "baroque element" is an excellent example of the restless striving for variety so characteristic of the Hellenistic time. I quite agree with Daniel that "just that sort of thing had not been done before" and that the sculptor was probably inventing as he worked; but it was a search for something new, something different, in the period after art had attained its highest possible development in one direction. In the Hellenistic period we find it in the head of Asclepius (cf. Wolters, *Athen. Mitth.* 1892, pp. 12 ff., Taf. IV) which is the nearest parallel to the Anytus of any of the heads (especially characteristic are the great breadth and height of cheek), and the Poseidon from Melos (*B.C.H.* 1889, pp. 498 ff., Pl. III), assigned by Collignon to the second century, a little before the renaissance period (cf. Pliny, *H.N.* XXXIV, 51), and called one of the few works representing the last efforts of Hellenism in its own country. The tendency runs wild in the Pergamene sculptures, which exemplify both the outer expression (baroque) and inner feeling (pathetic) carried to the greatest extreme.

There are certain interesting resemblances between Damophon and the second Pergamene period. Farnell (*J.H.S.* 1886, p. 266) speaks of a lack of vivid characterization and spirituality in the Pergamene sculptures, and these traits we have already seen in Damophon. In the analysis of Pergamene characteristics we find that they have, in common with Damophon's work, the high oval contour of the face, the emphasis on flesh rather than on bone structure, the full short lips¹ (Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, II, pp. 547-548; and *J.H.S.* 1890, p. 183), but we do not find in Damophon such exaggeration of line, expression, and composition. The reason for this difference may, I think, be found in the fact that Damophon was a Greek working in Greece, and while he may well have been

¹ A good example of this is a woman's head in Berlin (Collignon, *Hist. de la Sc. gr.* II, Fig. 249) very like that of Artemis in the modelling of the face and the shape of the mouth.

able to see the works at Pergamon (among them the great altar), he was able still more easily to see the works of the great Greek sculptors of the best period and to keep in constant touch with them. We know that he was at Olympia, and we know what he probably saw there, and, further, that he worked on the Zeus of Phidias.

An illustration of Damophon's striving for variety is embodied in his feeling for texture. Take first the hair. As pointed out by Daniel, it would be difficult to find hair represented in three more varied ways than the heads show. That of Demeter, in soft masses, recalls the head from the Acropolis belonging to the fourth century and connected by some with Scopas (Collignon, *Hist. de la Sc. gr.* II, Fig. 125). It is as simple a treatment as possible. The hair of Artemis is elaborate to a high degree, yet is not overdone. Furtwängler says this style of hair does not appear before Praxiteles, and Percy Gardner evidently agrees with him, as he compares a head from Sunium with such hair (*J.H.S.* 1895, Pl. VI, which he dates, p. 188, soon after 400 B.C.) to one of the figures on the Mantinean relief. After Praxiteles it became a common style for young people, both mortals and goddesses,¹ and occurs frequently on coins (cf. Head, *Guide*, Pl. 46, 25, of Arsinoë Philadelphus, 281 B.C.), becoming more elaborate and broken into little parts as time progressed (Furtwängler, *Beschreibung der Glyptothek*, 211). This arrangement was much in vogue among the young girls of Tanagra and it is of unusual interest that we find the same style of hair on a little statuette of Artemis from Tanagra (Furtwängler, *Coll. Sabouroff*, Pls. CXXV and CXXVI), a unique representation of the goddess among the Tanagra figurines.² Taken in connection with Damophon, it is of

¹ Cf. Furtwängler, *Collection Sabouroff*, text to Pls. CXXV and CXXVI; also Mitchell, *History of Greek Sculpture*, p. 728, note 1209, for further references.

² Furtwängler has shown the attitude of the goddess (leaning with one arm on a column) to be like that of a marble statuette from Cyprus (Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, II, Pl. XXX, a), which he says is an original work of the school of Praxiteles and Scopas, and which preserves the dignity of the goddess in face and costume.

importance as showing that the conception of Artemis was no longer that of a goddess, for the statuette shows no attempt at dignity; it is more like a girl ready for the chase. Certain characteristics correspond almost exactly to the description of Artemis given by Pausanias. We find the nebris, the quiver, the hunting dog (standing in the statuette), and we may naturally infer that the Artemis of Damophon wore the short garment so common in the later representations of Artemis. Beyond this the resemblance need not be pressed, but since the spirit in which this little figure is conceived is not far from that of Damophon, it is interesting to find a technical resemblance as well.

After this long digression it is time to return to the subject of feeling for texture. The hair of Anytus can be less easily paralleled.¹ It would almost seem in this case as if the artist were impressed by the crispness and fresh look of his clay model and made the daring experiment of translating it into marble.

The drapery has been an endless source of trouble to those who have attempted to date the sculptures, and it is one of the strongest reasons given by Collignon for putting them as late as the second century. Aside from the fact that it is never safe for us to say that the Greeks would or would not have done such and such a thing, it has been shown by Daniel that the subjects on the robe may all be traced back to the fourth century. The animal procession goes back as far as the Mycenaean period.² But the frequent recurrence of these same subjects on later works shows that they did not die out in the fourth century. As for the composition of the bands of decoration, their avoidance of overcrowding, their good balance and sense of proportion, I must confess that, if dated in the second century, they are far superior to what one would have expected.

¹ Farnell (*Cults*, II, pp. 547-548) suggests one of the giants on the Pergamene altar.

² See Cook, 'Animal Worship in the Mycenaean Age,' *J.H.S.* 1894, pp. 81-169.

Comparison has been made with a relief from Thermopylae (Cavvadias, *Γλυπτὰ τοῦ Ἑθνικοῦ Μουσείου*, 221, 222; Fig. 6 in Daniel's article) and the well-known Munich relief with the marriage of Poseidon and Amphitrite (Furtwängler, *Glyptothek*, 239). If the Lycosura designs are purer and more orderly than these, it may be partly due to Damophon's taste and sense of fitness, which save him from falling into the excesses shown in much Hellenistic work. The question as to whether he avoids the more glaring vices of that period because he antedates it or because he was a better artist than others has already been raised. The drapery — to whatever period we may assign it — is unparalleled in Greek sculpture known to us, and yet it seems strange that no one else should have done such an obvious thing as to transfer into stone the embroidered robe with which it was customary to drape many statues.¹ This was a very natural thing for Damophon, with his skill in chryselephantine work, to attempt.

A second reason why such an innovation would appeal to Damophon is because it gave him another opportunity or test for his skill in expressing his feeling for texture. The possibilities in representation of drapery had been exhausted as far as regards difference in plain texture, transparence, or even the use of it as an accessory; and the introduction of relief on the drapery was something new, at least in marble, as far as we can judge from remains. Probably the reason why such work did not become more general was because it needed an artist of marked ability to do it successfully.²

Such a man was the brilliant and erratic Damophon, far surpassing his contemporaries in good taste and in technical skill. The sculptures are the work of a virtuoso who shows his facility in many directions, but who at times is extremely careless

¹ On the draping of statues see Frazer, *Paus.* Vol. II, pp. 574 ff. *Ἐβρα*, bronze statues, and even the acrolithic statue of Ilithyia by Damophon at Aegium (*Paus.* VIII, 23, 5) were clad in real garments. Compare also vase-paintings.

² The stiff decorations on the corslets of the Roman emperors, the embroidered strip on the archaistic Athena in Dresden, and the robe of Hekate (Harrison, *Ancient Athens*, p. 381, Fig. 17) can hardly be called drapery.

about the finish of details. No one will deny that they are the works of a man of ability and of a high order of talent, but who lacks just that touch of genius which would make him really great and of far-reaching influence.

There must be added here an argument from probability which taken alone would be dangerous, but when taken in connection with other evidence only serves to strengthen what has already been said. The sculptors who are not of highest rank, but who belong in the general current of the fourth century, might be omitted by Pliny, but it would seem strange that if Damophon (who was not in the general current) lived at that time, there is no mention of him in Pliny or in any of Pliny's sources, and no evidence of a school based on his style. On the other hand, if he belongs in the scorned Dark Ages of the Hellenistic period, of the art history of which we know little from literature, the omission of his name is not strange. The Aphrodite of Melos, the Poseidon, the Asclepius, and the Nike of Samothrace show that, in spite of this lack of information, there were many good sculptors during that period.

If Damophon is assigned to the second century B.C., he not only falls in with the spirit of the time, but he is among good sculptors, and there is thus no difficulty, or disgrace to him, in our acceptance of this date, to which the evidence, taken as a whole, clearly points.

IDA CARLETON THALLON.

March, 1905.

A CLASSIFIED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LYCOSURA

I. TOPOGRAPHY AND IDENTIFICATION BEFORE THE EXCAVATIONS

- BOBLAYE, P.: *Recherches Géographiques sur les Ruines de la Morée* (1832), pp. 162-163.
 BURSIA, K.: *Geographie von Griechenland* (2 vols. 1862-1872), II, pp. 237 ff.
 CURTIUS, E.: *Peloponnesus* (2 vols. 1851-1852), I, pp. 295 ff., 337 r. 10.
 DODWELL, E.: *Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece during 1801, 1805, and 1806* (2 vols. 1819), II, pp. 394 ff.
Expédition Scientifique de la Morée (3 vols. 1831), II, pp. 40-41; Pl. 35. II.
 GELL, SIR W.: *Itinerary of Greece* (1810), p. 101.
 LEAKE, W. M.: *Peloponnesiaca* (1846), p. 244.
 LEAKE, W. M.: *Travels in the Morea* (3 vols. 1830), II, pp. 308 ff., 312.
 MÜLLER, K. O.: *History and Antiquities of the Doric Race* (2d ed., tr. by Tufnell and Lewis, 1839), p. 447.

PAUSANIAS: *Description of Greece*, VIII, 37.

ROSS, L.: *Reisen und Reiserouten durch Griechenland* (vol. I, 1841), pp. 84 ff.

WELCKER, F. G.: *Tagebuch einer griechischen Reise* (2 vols. 1865), I, pp. 264 ff.

II. THE EXCAVATIONS

1. BRIEF SUMMARIES OF THE WORK AS IT PROGRESSED:

Am. J. Arch. 1889, p. 378 (from *Athenaeum*, Aug. 17, Sept. 28); 1890, p. 209 (from *Berl. Phil. W.* Dec. 21, 1889).

Arch. Anz. 1886, p. 73 (Conze).

Athenaeum, 1889 (Aug. 17), p. 234; (Sept. 28), p. 425; 1895 (Aug. 3), p. 169 (Lambros).

Berl. Phil. W. 1889, pp. 1610-1611; 1896, p. 769.

B. C. H. 1893, p. 201.

Δελτίον ἀρχαιολογικόν, 1889, pp. 122, 153 ff., 159-163, 170, 202; 1890, pp. 43-45, 99 ff., 113.

J. H. S. 1891, pp. 390-391 (E. A. G.).

Athen. Mitth. 1890, p. 230; 1895, pp. 375 ff.

R. Arch. 1890, I, p. 268; II, 241; 1893, II, p. 259; 1894, II, p. 88.

R. Ét. Gr. 1889, p. 423 (Haussoullier); 1889, pp. 274-255 (Th. Reinach).

2. MORE COMPLETE PUBLICATIONS:

BAEDEKER, K.: *Greece* (3d ed. 1905), pp. 387 ff.

CAVADIAS, P.: *Fouilles de Lycosoura* (1893), I.

FRAZER, J. G.: *Pausanias* (6 vols. 1898), IV, pp. 367 ff.; V, pp. 622 ff.

GUIDE-JOANNE: II, (*Grèce et les Îles*), pp. 307 ff.

Πρακτικά τῆς ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρίας, 1896 (pub. 1897), pp. 93-126, with four plates (Leonardos).

SITTL, K., in I. VON MÜLLER's *Handbuch der Klass. Alt. Wiss.* VI, p. 110.

INSCRIPTIONS ARE PUBLISHED IN

'*Εφ. Ἀρχ.* 1895, cols. 263-274; 1896, cols. 101-130, 217 ff.; 1898, cols. 249 ff.

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ARCHITECTURE:

Ami des Monuments, VI (1892), No. 31, pp. 150-164 (Normand).

J. H. S. 1904, pp. 47-48, 54-55 (Daniel).

Athen. Mitth. 1893, pp. 219-221 (Dörpfeld).

DISCUSSION OF THE SCULPTURES:

COLLIGNON, M.: *Histoire de la Sculpture grecque* (2 vols. 1892-1897), II, pp. 627-630.

CAVADIAS, P.: *Fouilles*, pp. 8-14.

CONZE, A.: *Arch. Anz.* 1893, p. 125.

DANIEL, A. M.: *J. H. S.* 1904, pp. 41-57.

DIEHL, CH.: *R. Ét. Gr.* 1894, pp. 232-233.

FARNELL, L. R.: *Cults of the Greek States* (3 vols. [2 publ.] 1896), II, pp. 546-548.

GARDNER, E. A.: *Handbook of Greek Sculpture* (2 vols. 1896-1897), pp. 399 ff.; Appendix (1906), p. 548.

GARDNER, E. A.: *Athenaeum*. 1889, p. 713 (quoted in *Am. J. Arch.* 1889, p. 491); 1890, p. 783; *J. H. S.* 1890, pp. 213-214; 1906, pp. 169-175.

GARDNER, P.: *Cl. R.* 1897, p. 71.

MILCHHOFER, A.: *Berl. Phil. W.* 1895, pp. 948-951.

OVERBECK, J. A.: *Gesch. d. gr. Plastik*. 4th ed. (2 vols. 1893), II, pp. 485 ff.

REINACH, S.: *Gaz. B.-A.* 1894, I, pp. 229-233; *R. Arch.* 1895, II, p. 338.

ROBERT, K.: *Hermes*, 1894, pp. 429-435.

SITTL, K.: in von Müller's *Handbuch*, VI, p. 751.

WALDSTEIN, C.: *Athenaeum*, 1890, p. 377 (quoted in *Am. J. Arch.* 1890, p. 209); *J. H. S.* 1904, pp. 330-331.

Unsigned: *Athenaeum*, 1890, p. 840.

VITA

THE writer was born in Brooklyn, New York, and received her preliminary education at the Packer Collegiate Institute. She was graduated from Vassar College in 1897 with the degree of A.B.; in 1899-1901 she was a student in the American School of Classical Studies at Athens; and in 1901, with three others, conducted excavations at the cave of Vari in Attica. In 1901 she received the degree of A.M. from Vassar College, and in 1901-1903 was Instructor in Greek in that institution. In 1903 she entered the School of Philosophy in Columbia University, where she remained until 1905. In 1903-1904 she held a Curtis Graduate Scholarship; in 1904-1905 she was Babbott Fellow of Vassar College. The degree of Ph.D. was conferred upon her in 1905. The writer's major subject at Columbia was Classical Archæology; her minors were Greek and Latin. She has taken courses under Professors Earle, Egbert, McCrea, Olcott, Peck, Perry, Wheeler, and Young. In Athens she attended courses under Professors Dörpfeld, Perry, Richardson, Smyth, and Wilhelm. She has published "Marble Reliefs from Vari," in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. VII, 1903.

